ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis	2. Date	
□Original ⊠Updated □Corrected	12/01/2023	
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse	Number if applicable)	
NR 20, Fishing: Inland and Outlying Waters; NR 26, Fish Refuges		
4. Subject		
FH-14-22, minor changes to fishing regulations on inland, outlying and b	boundary waters (the 2023 Fisheries Management hous ekeeping	
rule) 5. Fund Sources Affected	6 Chapter 20 State Appropriations Attested	
	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected	
7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule		
⊠No Fiscal Effect □Increase Existing Revenues	Increase Costs	
☐ Indeterminate ☐ Decrease Existing Revenues	Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget	
8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)		
State's Economy		
Local Government Units	c Utility Rate Payers	
Smal	Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)	
9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, pers. 227.137(3)(b)(1).		
\$0		
10. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals Be \$10 Million or more Over Any 2-year Period, pers. 227.137(3)(b)(2)?		
∐Yes ⊠No		
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule		
This rule will correct minor errors and inconsistencies and make minor updates to ensure that administrative code language that governs fishing in inland, outlying, and boundary waters is accurate and properly reflects the desired management of Wisconsin waters.		
12. Summary of the Businesses, Business Sectors, Associations Representing Business, Local Governmental Units, and Individuals that may be Affected by the Proposed Rule that were Contacted for Comments.		
This is a level 3 economic impact analysis (minimal economic impact of less than \$50,000). A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis was posted on the department's website for review by businesses, sectors, governmental units, and individuals. No economic comments were received.		
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA.		
A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis was posted on the department's website for review by businesses, sectors,		
governmental units, and individuals. Local governmental units did not participate in development of this EIA as they were not expected to be impacted by this rule.		
14. Summaryof Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Specific Businesses, Business Sectors, Public Utility Rate Payers, Local Governmental Units and the State's Economyas a Whole (Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred)		
The proposed rule will have minimal impact on anglers, with no econor there will be a requirement for anglers to learn the new rules. How reflect existing policies for which anglers must already comply, or connected waters. The department works to notify the public of ne	vever, a majority of this rule clarifies administrative code to reduces the complexity of fishing regulations on	
regulations pamphlets.		
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementi	-	
The rule is being pursued to ensure the rule language that governs fishing in inland, outlying, and boundary waters is accura te and properly reflects the desired management of Wisconsin waters. An alternative would be to leave the code as is, which leads to confusion among the public and law enforcement and may also result in inadequate management of fisheries resources.		
16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule Fishing regulations, such as length and bag limits or season dates, are department has used different types of fishing regulations in order to: of sizes of fish in a lake or stream; provide different types of fishing expen-	control angler impacts on fish populations; maintain numbers and	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

access to fishing as fair as possible. This rule includes minor changes to administrative code that support existing policies and fisheries management goals.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

Authority to promulgate fishing regulations is granted to states. None of the proposed changes violate or conflict with federal regulations.

18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)

Fisheries management rules are generally similar in the states surrounding Wisconsin. Each bordering state regulates fishing by the use of seasons, bag limits and size limits. Specific seasons and bag and size limits may differ for species among the surrounding states, but the general principles are the same. Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois all have statewide seasons and bag and size limits for fish species, along with special or experimental regulations on individual waters.

19. Contact Name	20. Contact Phone Number
Meredith Penthorn	608-316-0080